



California Department of Transportation

Office of Community Planning – 2002/03 Legislative Session

June 6, 2003

| BILL | AUTHOR | SUBJECT | SYNOPSIS |
|--|------------|------------------------------|---|
| SCA 2 12/2/02 | Torlakson | Smart Growth Funding | This bill would authorize cities, counties, and regional transportation planning agencies to impose a special tax for transportation projects and smart growth planning. This special tax would only be imposed with the approval of majority of vote instead of 2/3 vote. |
| SCA 2 2/20/03 | Torlarkson | Smart Growth Funding | This amended bill would also authorize local transportation authorities to the above list of agencies to impose a special tax for transportation projects and smart growth planning. |
| AB 35 12/2/02 | Wiggins | General Plans | This bill would requires planning agencies to include the degree their approved general plans complies with general plan guidelines and provisions of environmental justice and livable communities in their annual report. This annual report is submitted every October 1 st to the Office of Planning and Research, state legislature and the Department of Housing and Community Development. |
| AB 721 2/19/03 | Mathews | General Plans | This bill would require a city and county general plan to include an urban growth boundary. This urban growth boundary shall indicates the area to which a city or county intends to extend urban services for the next 20 years. It would also require the Office of Planning and Research to develop a state model-zoning ordinance that emphasizes smart growth. In addition, if any local or regional agency adopts and implements this ordinance, the entity would receive priority in the award of infrastructure, housing, commercial or industrial development, or other economic development grants. |
| AB 723 2/19/03 | Mathews | Jobs and Housing Balance | This bill would allow local governments to infrastructure financing districts in “job-housing opportunity zones.” These zones would be created in Alameda, Contra Costa, Santa Clara, San Joaquin, and Stanislaus. Local governments could provide tax-increment financing for public facilities within these zones to mitigate the current and future regional imbalance of jobs and housing in these five Bay Area counties. |
| AB 1410 2/21/03 | Wolk | Transit-Oriented Development | This bill requires a written offer to sell or lease excess land for the purpose of developing a transit village or transit-oriented development (TOD) be sent to any county, city, redevelopment agency, public transportation authority, or housing authority. In addition, this bill requires that a written offer to sell or lease excess state lands located within 1/3 mile of a transit station be first offered for sale or exchange to develop a transit village or TOD to the city, county, redevelopment agency, housing authority, or public transportation agency. |
| AB 1410* 4/21/03 (Amend- ed) | Wolk | Transit-Oriented Development | This amendment removes language that would include the above requirements in the Streets and Highway Code, in addition to the California Government Code. |
| SB 744 2/21/03 | Dunn | General Plans | This bill would provide that a city, county, or city and county that has met at least 10% of its housing needs for the very low, low and moderate income categories during the preceding year or 30% over the preceding three years shall receive priority in the eligibility of competitive state grants or loans for planning, infrastructure, commercial or industrial development or other economic development. |
| SB 744 4/21/03 (Amend- ed) | Dunn | General Plans | This amended bill would removes an important incentive that if cities and counties meet their affordability needs, they shall receive priority in the eligibility of competitive state grants and loans for partnering, infrastructure, commercial or industrial development and other economic development. |



California Department of Transportation Office of Community Planning – 2002/03 Legislative Session *June 6, 2003*

| BILL | AUTHOR | SUBJECT | SYNOPSIS |
|--|---------|------------------------------|--|
| SB 723 5/5/03 (Amended) | Mathews | Jobs and Housing Balance | <p>This amendment bill would require the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 2/3 vote to form the infrastructure district; 2) issue the general obligation bonds; 3) set an appropriation limit; 4) authorize that public entities can vote against the formation of such districts. |
| SB 465 2/20/03 | Soto | Transit-Oriented Development | <p>This bill would require the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the Office of Planning & Research to convene a task force and create statewide guidelines for best practices for transit villages in the state; 2) expand the area for transit village plans from ¼-mile to ½-mile of a rail station; 3) add a provision for affordable housing in transit villages; 4) expands the definition of blight to allow the designation and implementation of “Transit Village Redevelopment Project Areas” with tax-increment financing capabilities to fund the implementation of higher-density development that is supportive of transit use within ½-mile of rail stations. |
| SB 465 (Amended) 3/26/03 | Soto | Transit-Oriented Development | <p>This amended bill removes provisions for changing an existing redevelopment plan to incorporate a Transit Village Redevelopment Plan.</p> |
| SB 465 (Amended) 4/21/03 | Soto | Transit-Oriented Development | <p>This amended bill does the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. removes a requirement that OP&R convene a task-force to create statewide guidelines for best practices for transit village design and planning; 2. deletes old data on transit ridership; 3. cites Department TOD Study in California; 4. adds a new definition of blight in order to legally engage in redevelopment activities, such as tax-increment financing. |
| SB 465 (Amended) 4/29/03 | Soto | Transit-Oriented Development | <p>This amended bill adds new provisions for making a finding of blight so that redevelopment activities can be engaged, such as tax increment financing, etc.</p> |
| AB 1320 (Amended) 4/01/03 | Dutra | Transit-Oriented Development | <p>The changes to this bill in this amendment makes is identical to SB 465 (Soto) in that it would allow the establishment of a Transit Village redevelopment area within a ½ mile radius of rail stations. It differs from SB 465 (Soto) in that it does <u>not</u>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. require OP&R to create statewide guidelines on best practices; 2. include a provision for affordable housing; 3. remove provisions to allow existing redevelopment plans to be amended to incorporate a Transit Village Redevelopment Plan. (The 3/26/03 amendment to the Soto bill removed this provision). |



California Department of Transportation **Office of Community Planning – 2002/03 Legislative Session** *June 6, 2003*

| BILL | AUTHOR | SUBJECT | SYNOPSIS |
|--|---------|----------------|--|
| AB 1123 2/21/03 | Parra | Main Streets | This bill would transfer the California Main Street Program to the Office of Historic Preservation in the Department of Parks and Recreation. |
| AB 1123 4/21/03 | Parra | Main Streets | This bill would transfer the California Main Street Program to the Office of Historic Preservation in the Department of Parks and Recreation. However, OHP is expected to administer the program within existing resources, effectively cutting this program. |
| AB 1123 4/24/03 | Parra | Main Streets | This amended bill would remove chair representation from several legislative committees who provide economic guidance to the program. |
| AB 1268 4/10/03 (Amended) | Wiggins | General Plans | <p>This bill requires by January 1, 2004, with certain exceptions, every city, county, and city and county to designate within a general plan one or more growth zones where the jurisdiction intent to extend infrastructure services over a 20-year period. It would require these entities to adopt findings by January 1, 2005, that the adopted growth zone or exemption meets the requirements of this bill. It would also prohibit extension of infrastructure services beyond the growth zone after adopting the findings that the growth zone meets the requirements of the bill.</p> <p>In addition, this bill would require these entities to adopt an inclusionary housing program by January 1, 2005 that ensues no less than 20% of residential units are affordable to very low and low income households. This bill would also require a 10-year wait for changing within the growth zone.</p> |
| AB 1492 5/1/03 | Laird | Williamson Act | <p>This bill proposes the following changes:</p> <p>1) prohibits local governments from approving lot line adjustments on contracted land unless it complies with the Subdivision Map Act and does not result in additional residential units.</p> <p>2) provides that any land improvement on contracted land that is inconsistent with the W-Act, compatible use rules, zoning, or ordinances, is a breach of contract, including nonagricultural commercial, industrial, or residential construction).</p> |